DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 386 SP 007 569

TITLE	Pilot Program: San Francisco Center for Advanced Teacher Development.
INSTITUTION	San Francisco Univ., Calif.
PUB DATE	Nov 73
NOTE	17p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	College School Cooperation; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Public Schools; Seminars; Summer Schools; *Teacher Centers; Team Teaching
IDENTIFIERS	Distinguished Achievement Awards Entry

ABSTRACT

The pilot summer session of this program was Phase I in the establishment of year-round, in-service centers within operating public schools. Teachers who seek advanced credentials in administration, counseling, or reading specialization will be able to apply for reassignment to the center for the duration of their advanced training. For this summer school, 60 teachers were assigned in three-person teaching teams in two schools for grades K-7 and 7-12. Having a three-person team permitted one or more of the teachers to be released for seminars during the school day. Five university professors led the seminars on nine specialized topics. The program was evaluated by 22 of the participating teachers to ascertain the validity and feasibility of such a cooperative venture. (Author)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 085386

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Part 1. Pilot Program: San Francisco Center for Advanced Teacher Development

San Francisco State University and the San Francisco Unified School District jointly planned and coordinated a summer school program to study the feasibility of a San Francisco Center for Advanced Teacher Development.

Two regular summer schools, one for grades K-6 and one for grades 7-12, housed five college professors, 69 teachers and 500 children for the six-week program. Coordination was handled jointly by Dr. James Duggins, San Francisco State University and Mr. Roy Minkler, Director of Reading, San Francisco Schools. Selected teachers were placed in three-person teams in each of the public school classrooms and five university professors led on-site seminars around nine topics of specialization toward the advanced credentials. Because there were three teachers in each classroom, one or more of the teachers could be released to attend the seminar sessions during the summer school day.

Working with a very small budget for the project, teachers were not paid for their laboratory teaching, but received nine graduate units for their seminar participation. The total budget was $22,000, of which $10,000 was defrayed by ADA for the school children.

The summer school program is seen as Phase I in the establishment of year round inservice centers within the public schools. As envisioned, teachers who seek advanced credentials may apply for reassignment to the Center for the duration of their credential work.

An evaluation of the program was conducted by 22 of the participating teachers with assistance of one university professor.

SP 007 569

Part 2. Case Study: Pilot Project

San Francisco Center for Advanced Teacher Development

A Cooperative School and University Venture

The experiment recounted here is the story of an effort by the San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco State University to meld their skills in a coordinated center to deliver greater service in an area of unquestionable national need: competencies in reading, counseling, and administration.

History of the Project

In August, 1972, Mrs. James Abrahamson, Commissioner of the San Francisco Unified School District Board of Education and Chairman of its Curriculum Committee, discussed the need for greater coordination between the District and San Francisco State University at an informal luncheon with Dr. Asa Hilliard, Dean of the School of Education of the University. From that initial meeting a series of informal luncheons involved a widening group of people including school district staff, local principals, university faculty, community business personnel, and school volunteers. Those "rap" sessions were a beginning, a chance to ventilate mutual problems, grow expansive about some few successes, but most of all a chance to meet each other and resolve to cooperate.

A call for specific mutual programs was made. Responding to that plea, school staff and university professors returned to their separate "huddles" to plan definite proposals. Among the group preparing specific proposals from the University were Dr. James Duggins, Associate Professor of Secondary Education, Dr. Louis Falik, Associate Professor of Counseling,

Mr. Thomas Finn, Assistant Professor of Secondary Education, and Dr. John Tibbetts, Associate Professor of Secondary Education. Their proposal was reviewed and supported by Mr. Roy Minkler, Director of Reading of the San Francisco Unified School District. In January, 1972, Dr. Duggins presented their proposal for a "San Francisco Center for Advanced Teacher Development" to the luncheon group (now numbering over 50 people from the various groups).

As a result of that proposal, the following program emerged:

> Toward the long-range establishment of a San Francisco Center for Teaching Development, school sites were selected for the development of teachers with advanced competencies at all levels, K-12. A junior high school and a feeder elementary school were selected as demonstration centers for the preparation of these advanced teacher competencies in specialized areas urgently needed in urban schools. The University went to these schools to build cooperatively within the school through in-service, the curriculum used with children and in teacher training.
>
> The first of these advanced competencies programs was designed to accomodate the new Ryan Bill Specialist Credentials in Reading and Counseling.
>
> We saw these special school-site teacher development centers as field locations to which teachers from throughout the district came for advanced preparation to work with one another from various teaching disciplines and functional roles while at the same time advancing their specific and particular competencies.

SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION: SHORT RANGE

> In order to launch the program, smooth internal difficulties, begin initial recruitment and "walk through" the first sequence, an initial special, but operating, summer session was designed to include participants from various levels (elementary, junior high school, senior high school) and professional functions (teachers, counselors, administrators) and an appropriate number of children, not to exceed 250. This special summer school for regular SFUSD pupils was held in one of the regular junior high schools and an elementary school. This summer school had an enrichment curriculum for pupils and was used as the base for in-service activities in reading. It was necessary for the summer school to be supplied as closely as possible to the regular level during the school year.

An interdisciplinary teaching staff was necessary for the program. The staff was drawn from the School of Education at San Francisco State University, the teaching staff of the San Francisco Unified School District, the academic departments at San Francisco State University, and from the community. This staff was formed as an on-site interdisciplinary training team and was responsible for the direction of the practicum.

Teachers from the SFUSD enrolled for nine units of credit in regular summer session programs. Four to five courses were proposed from which each teacher chose three, dependent upon their background and long-range credential objectives. The courses proposed were:

Education 620 - Introduction to Teaching Reading
Selection of materials for adolsecents; developing technical vocabulary; skills in the content fields; motivating the hard-to-reach adolescent; problems of the culturally disadvantaged. No prior background in reading instruction required.

Education 722 - Teaching Reading in Content Fields
Evaluation of methods of teaching reading in high school subjects. Analysis of most commonly used materials for matters of readability, relevance, bias and the implied study skills needed for their mastery. (Prerequisite: at least one previous course in reading or approval of instructor.)

Counseling 780 -Seminar on the interdisciplinary approach to the basic problems of learning in school; review of research in education, psychology, anthropology and pediatrics on learning difficulties. Open only to experienced teachers and counselors. Not to be taken concurrently with Education 781.

Education Administration (Course to be determined.)

Counseling 827- Consulting with Teachers and with Parents Regarding Learning Diffi culties
Prerequisites: Coun. 705, 715, or Educ. 781 and consent of instructor. Seminar exploring dynamics of the consultation process; implications for various specialists in developing effective working relationships with teachers and parents of children with learning difficulties.

BASIC FIELD FORMAT:

The practicum was conducted in three parts:

1. Actual classroom teaching by peer teams of teachers under the direction of the on-site training team. It was conducted on a daily basis for two full periods a day.
2. Evaluation and planning sessions were held on a daily basis for the pper teams. The specific strategies which were attempted were selected from issues, concerns, or deficits which the teachers themselves identified in planning sessions.
3. Special long-term concerns were treated in depth through graduate seminars provided during the final third of the school day. This session as well as both of the others was two hours in length.

ON-SITE TRAINING TEAM

-- Selected master teachers from SFUSD
-- CSU-SF professors from the School of Education and from selected academic departments
-- Highly qualified community people who understood the community in depth and who could communicate effectively about the implications of their experience for teachers.

Once selected, this team became a peer training team. That is to say the lines between groups were ignored and all members developed and modified the in-service plan as needed. Like the teachers, the Training Team made its specific plans on a daily basis.

DISTRICT EVALUATION

An integral role of the San Francisco Center for Teacher Development was the cautious leadership in assessment and curriculum development as well as teacher education. For several years the SFUSD Director of Reading pointed to such needs as:

1. The desire for on-site continuing staff and curriculum development.

2. Assessment of pupil needs and matching of learning materials to individual needs.

3. Prescription of instruction based on diagnosis of learning deficiencies.

4. Additional and differentiated staffing including reading teachers, student teachers, and paraprofessionals for reading instruction only.

5. Extensive materials with teacher option in selection for classroom use.

6. Fostering positive teacher attitudes and expectations for pupil performance by actively involving them in decision making at the on-site level.

7. Strengthening administrative leadership and support for change when the need is recognized at the site level. Alert administrators know the right time to encourage teachers ready to implement attainable changes in teaching approaches.

LONG RANGE OBJECTIVES

1. To establish on-site training centers for advanced competencies.

2. To increase coordination between University-School District communities.

3. To develop and refine viable educational models for curricular development and pupil personnel services of an interdisciplinary team nature.

4. To provide demonstration observation settings for personnel throughout the District.

5. To provide teams of specialists to assist building-level programs throughout the District in the development or implementation of modified or innovative programs such as:

   a. expertise in diagnoiss-prescription of specific learning problems
   b. assessment of on-going programs
   c. publicize and promote effective programs

6. To assist in developing and establishing other centers in the District.

(Summer, 1973)

Selected Elementary and Junior High School

E D U C A T O R S

1. Administrators
2. Counselors FROM Sr. High Sch. / Jr. High Sch. / Elementary Sch.
3. Teachers (From all subject areas)

S T U D E N T S

APPROX. 200-250 STUDENTS

Class work with reading emphaiss

T A S K S

1. INITIATE PHASE I DEVELOPMENT CENTER
   Application of principles from coursework and planning
2. BEGIN ADVANCED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
   Participants take 3 or 4 professional courses in counseling or teaching reading. These courses make work possible toward advanced credentials.

At the University, the proposal was discussed with Dr. William Evraiff, Chairman, Department of Counseling, Dr. George Hallowitz, Chairman of Educational Administration, Dr. Dorothy Westby-Gibson, Chairman of Secondary Education, and Dr. Margaret Weymouth, Chairman of Elementary Education. In addition, the proposal was reviewed by the Associate Deans, Dr. Alfred Jensen and Dr. Metta Zahorsky. Althouth each group gave approval to the program, as the circle of persons who had to be informed widened, the communication problem became very complex. Within both institutions, we found it necessary to communicate with evern concerned individual about every event in the progress of the program.

Late in February, the proposal was presented to the Curriculum Committee of the Board of Education. At tha t time, Dr. Lloyd O'Connor, Associate Dean for Summer Sessions, San Francisco State University, was apprised of the possibility that this program would involve a "contract" program for Summer Session 1973.

Because the program was envisioned as an inservice program in reading, Mr. Roy Winkler, Director of Reading for the San Francisco Schools, worked most diligently from the SFUSD Central Office to keep communications open there. In March, a need for a summer session experience for children was expressed by the Mission Coalition Organization Education Committee. Considering the lack of funds for summer sessions schools, Mr. Winkler saw an opportunity to mesh the proposed inservice program with a Mission District summer school. Although it put a different cast upon the "Center for Advanced Teacher Development" proposal, the University agreed.

The spring saw a particularly crowded Board agenda, but at a stormy School Board meeting on April 24, 1973, a resolution budgeting this special summer session program was passed. The program was to be housed in two

Mission District Schools, Hawthorne Elementary School and Horace Mann Junior High School.

Special Summer School Program

34-24 Sp 2 RESOLVED: That the Board of Education adopt the following special summer school program which meshes the Mission Model Cities Summer School request with the California State University, San Francisco, "Institute for Advanced Competency" Program.

AND FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED: That the Board permit the Superintendant to use $8,000 now in the Supplies Section of the 1972-73 Reading Budget and that the Board of Education will commit the remainder of the $22,978.50 cost of the program from an unallocated amount being asked for in the 1973-74 Reading Budget.

Dr. Duggins and Mr. Minkler prepared applications for teacher-participants which were distributed to every school in the San Francisco District. Head teachers were also solicited. Announcements and student applications in English and Spanish were sent to all San Francisco schools attended by Mission District children (bussing durin the year has these children dispersed throughout the city). Further, the Mission Coalition Education Committee, with whom Dr. Duggins and Mr. Minkler were meeting frequently, disseminated student and teacher applications among bilingual teachers and students from private schools. The Education Committee of the Mission Coalition Organization was invited to review the head-teacher applicants.

Teacher-participant applications were ranked according to the following criteria:

A. Permanent tenure

B. Evidence of sincere interest in an advanced credential;

C. A teaching assignment that would benefit from the special program;

D. Special recommendations from staff who knew the quality of the applicant's work.

In all, 300 applications were received. Several confusing concurrent events complicated the selection process:

1. Some teachers applied "just in case";
2. Some teachers did not have current information about advanced credentials;
3. Ten new summer schools were proposed and some teachers were undecided about whether to work for the standard $35 a day or enter the University program.

Only nine prospective administrators applied of whom only six confirmed interest in the program. Because we could not offer a nine-unit program for six students the administrative component was dropped from the pilot project.

On June 18, 1973, 69 teachers and counselors, two head teachers, five University professors, and the Director of Reading met in the library at Horace Mann Junior High School for the first time to plan a summer session of teaching and learning that would begin two days later.

The three-teacher teams were assigned by the staff rather than self-selected. Although preference was given to the teachers' choices of grade level or subject area assignment, it was not always possible to honor their first choices.

Under these conditions, many teachers prepared exciting six-week learning experiences for the children and nearly always coordinated their University seminars to avoid conflict with team members.

Within a week, the major problems of coordination and administration were obvious.

1. There was a need for more University faculty. Because of the classroom assignments of teachers, we needed to have available the service of at least nine more units of faculty time to make greater number of seminars possible. As it was, all the University facul ty taught at least twice as many sections as the normal on-campus load.

2. Teachers needed at least three additional days to work together and plan the summer session for children.

3. The legality of the contract program had to be established by the two administrative agencies, San Francisco Unified School District and San Francisco State University.

2. Evaluation of the Program

Because we had not previously attempted this kind of program, we wanted to evaluate its many aspects. Some 22 teachers participated in a special project to analyze and evaluate the program from their various points of view. We present here the findings of that evaluation.

It seems most convenient to organize the comments around the above outline of problems known almost at the outset to the University and Central Office coordinators. One of the surprising facts that emerged from the evaluative process was the distance between the University faculty and the experienced classroom teachers in curriculum conceptualization. Although the University faculty anticipated greater readiness for innovation among tenured teachers, to the extent that it was lacking, knowledge of that lack can be of major importance in preparing future inservice programs.

The Time Factor

As noted above, the six weeks' duration of the experiment with a short five weeks' lead time from Board Resolution to the opening of school were noticed as critical lacks by the teacher-participant evaluators. One aspect of this, of course, was that the teachers came to this program directly from a strenuous teaching year in the Fall and Spring semesters. They had but three days respite before assumption of this new program of six weeks' teaching and learning.

> A suggestion offered by several was that the planning for the program should be jointly shared by an even larger group than had worked to develop this program and that these initital planning sessions would include teachers and head teachers. Expansion of the group to include these added components, of course, would require more than the year of development this program had.

The Team Teaching

In nearly every way the assigned teaching teams affected what happened throughout the program. Without time to learn to prepare and work together, the fact that the assigned classrooms involved cooperative work with a peer, affected the views of participants. The comments teachers made about working together reflected the good or poor fortune of arbitrary assignment to teams.

The following advantages and disadvantages were commented on by the teachers:

Advantages

1. It's more fun and easier to share the work with the other two teachers.
2. All the advantages are for the children.
3. Because there is more diversity, there is a possibility of teaching to one's strengths.
4. All children have a greater chance of being able to relate to at least one teacher.

5. Children can interact with more than one adult.

6. The children's environment and the classroom environment is enhanced by having more teachers.

7. Because there are more teachers, there are more creative ideas and supplies.

8. There is more input and stimulus for each child.

9. Because there are fewer materials this summer, it is good to have more teachers. This allows them to have more time to prepare.

Disadvantages

1. There isn't enough time for team planning. Too much time is spent before and after school planning with your team.

2. There is a greater possibility of a conflict.

3. Teaching methods vary and some conflict.

4. This summer the teachers are seldom all in the room at the same time. This causes a lack of continuity and follow-up to subjects presented in the class.

5. We were told from many sources that it wouldn't be like a normal summer school. We were told we would have lots of supplies. It's awful to have to spend so much out of our own pockets for supplies that should be supplied for by the district.

University Seminars

The arrangements for University seminars "on-site", during the school day presented special teaching and learning problems for all involved in the program, too. In general, however, the evaluations reveal these seminars to be high points of the program despite the special difficulties of scheduling and presentation for diverse, working teachers. About this aspect of the program, the evaluations report:

1. "An interview with the teachers show that the seminars were the key to the reading program. The current theore tical and practical aspect of reading in the content areas was suggestive of a change for better approaches and techniques. The knowledge of

reading principles, approaches and techniques and skills as applied in subject fields found their way in the classroom at least on an experimental basis. A random survey of opinions among students shows that they enjoyed learning English and math through the reading approach.

2. The Reading Program at Hawthorne School this summer has been a new and rewarding experience to most of the people who participated. Like any new program, adjustments must be made as situations arise. May I list the positive aspects of the program:

Continuity of courses offered
Title of courses labeled to fit individual needs
Courses presented within walking distance
Class coverage made available when conflicts arose
Excellent, flexible instructors from State.

3. "The Seminar period provided a unique daily forum for a highly professional exchange of experiences, particularly those relating to individual students in the program. It is my opinion that these seminars contributed greatly to the meeting of program objectives."

Not all of the comments about the seminars were positive. Of the teachers participating in the evaluation, two said:

4. "I feel the students would have learned far more had they been part of a clinical or laboratory experience in a course for teachers in the diagnosis and correction of reading disabilities. In such a course the teacher would diagnose and treat reading disability cases under experienced supervision. Prior to this time teachers should have taken a course covering cause of reading disabilities, observation and interviewing procedure; diagnostic instruments, and standard and informal tests."

5. "As it turned out, the seminars weren't seminars, but actual classes with the same lectures, outside reading and tests one would receive from a course on campus."

Perhaps the most distressing feature of the seminars was that as the teacher composition of the classes emerged and changed (administrative components dropped; teachers changing seminars; teachers changing from reading component to counseling, etc.), the seminar schedules conflicted with the teachers' preparations and classroom duties. The following comments were elicited:

6. "Our teaching time was limited because of seminars but between the three of us everything worked out smoothly."

7. "The next Monday, we started our College classes. Here we had some confusion because we found we had one class together on Monday and Wednesday. THis meant someone had to cover our class."

8. "Seminars during the four-hour period of the summer school prevented me from learning about the students. This prevented the establishing of channels by which I could teach the child to make him or her receptive to my particular type of teaching. This interruption also prevented the development of a systematic reading instruction. Sequences which should be followed in teaching the skills involved in learning to read were not carried through either from a lack of class time or because I did not know the next step; i.e., reading tests were given, but I did not know the remediation necessary as a follow-up. (By the second week of July, I, as well as two other teachers on the team, were in seminars from 9:30 to 11 or 12). As the fourth member of the team had chosen weekend seminars out at S.F. State College, she was with the class for more hours than the rest of the team. She felt this was unfair and some ill feeling was created as a result. But this schedule was beyond the control of any of us team members."

Without question, a major highlight of the entire program was the level of community involvement. This involvememb included such organizations as the Mission Coalition, the Neighborhood Youth Corps' Higher Horizons Program, and the San Francisco Education Auxiliary. In addition, head teachers were all chosen because of their ethnicity.

A surprise outgrowth of the program was a multi-cultural luncheon sponsored by the multi-cultural teachers and parents committee. The luncheon guests included faculty, staff, university representatives, children and parents. It provided a very warm and cohesive ending to the summer school session.

3. Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

Without undue whitewashing, this first experiment at greater coordination of University and public school facilities may be seen to be a success. The problems were great, and it is perhaps due to the sincere efforts of a very great number of people that the project did not flounder. Many people from the San Francisco Schools' Central Office and the University as well as the teacher-participants found the project demanded a great deal more than they anticipated when they committed themselves to it.

In addition to beginning to explore better ways of communication and coordination, this project has caused to emerge a group of idealistic professionals who work together toward the improvement of schools. Gratitude is due all of those so dedicated.

Despite the difficulties and uncertainty it is likely that fewer than half a dozen of the 100 persons involved in this project would not try again to achieve the goals of the program. A few of the closing remarks of the evaluators' summaries are:

> 1. "This program was an outstanding project to give both students and teachers an opportunity to learn various kinds of techniques. All persons involved benefited. One may wonder if he can work with others in the same room. This program was an outstanding mechanism by which a teacher could evaluate himself. Numerous questions entered my mind. Can I adapt to this kind of environment? How can I accept another teacher's technique that differs from mine? How may I strengthen my own teaching style by observing another? How does this teacher deal with a particular situation? Here was a golden opportunity to experience and appreciate the beauty of team teaching. More than this, I felt there evolved from these experiences, a mutual love, respect, and understanding for one another, and a sincere desire to be helpful."

2. "In summary, this program was exciting, interesting and truly a learning experience. The environment was promiscuous. There were mutual respect, cooperation, understanding. I learned many new ideas from the other teachers. Each teacher had strength that contributed to the atmosphere of the room. I feel this program was of great significance for the children, teachers, tutors and administration."

3. "I want to say I enjoyed this summer. It was a great deal of work but I feel I have answered some of the questions I wanted to know about in the teaching of reading in the corrective field. I have learned a little more about testing for specific difficulties. I have many books to read in the future. The program of bringing the college to the school I feel has a lot of merit."

4. "As I have already suggested, the overall program should be improved and continued. Some thought should be given to including a reading program of this kind in the regular school schedule. Many of the problems I have indicated could be solved as all the participants -- the professors, the teachers, and the community representatives -- acquire the experience that will only be theirs after a period of trial and error."

5. "Credit should be given to all participants in the program. College instructors were considerate of the teachers' situation, many teachers made valiant efforts, and the administrators' exciting onsite training program is still one of the best devised by teacher training educators. Subsequent in-service programs should benefit from the pilot program experience and have even better results."

6. "I sincerely hope that this program is a continuous thing. It is impossible for any teacher to go back into their classrooms without having some new ideas in how to work with an old problem, knowing they are not alone in seeking new ways in teaching, new materials and new approaches in learning to read. I have sincerely enjoyed being a part of the summer session."

ABSTRACT/INFORMATION FORM - 1974 DAA PROGRAM

(Please note: This information will be the basis for the description of your institution's DAA entry in the official DAA booklet given at the Annual Meeting and subsequently distributed widely.)

Please Type or Print:

Name of Program Submitted: Pilot Program: San Francisco Center for Advanced Teacher Development

Institution (complete name): San Francisco State University

President: Charles Romberg

Campus Public Information Officer:

Faculty Member Responsible for Program: James Duggins, Ph.D.

Title of the Faculty Member: Associate Professor, Secondary Education

Signature: James Duggins

Title: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, SEC. ED Date: 11/23/73

Please describe in 150-200 words the program which you have entered in the 1974 AACTE Distinguished Achievement Awards. A sample is included below to give a general idea of the kinds of information we need. Your abstract will be the basis for reporting your entry in Excellence in Teacher Education. Please continue on back if extra space is needed.

SAMPLE: *Hypothetical Sample Description:* Recognizing the necessity for public school teachers to have a continuing education as well as realizing the need for continually updating the elementary science curriculum, the College of Saint Alphonsia Joseph, together with the school district of Stockton, New Hampshire, began in 1969 the Advance Learning for Science Teachers Program (ALSTP). The program, initially funded by a National Science Foundation grant, features a six-week summer institute during which members of the college staff instruct teachers throughout the school district. Also, 30 consultants from the college's science and education departments visit each of the elementary schools during the year. Featured in the six-week institute are effective ways to teach environmental studies, using the neighborhood as key resource. The program has had sufficient impact to project a similar one for secondary science teachers.

This pilot summer session is seen as Phase I in the establishment of year round inservice centers within operating public schools. Teachers who seek advanced credentials in administration, counseling or reading specialists may apply for reassignment to the Center for the duration of their advanced training. For this summer school, 69 teachers were assigned in three-person teaching teams in two schools, of grades K-6 and 7-12. The three-person teams allowed one or more of the teachers to be released for seminars during the school day. Five university professors led the seminars about nine specialized topics. The program was evaluated by 22 of the participating teachers to ascertain the validity and feasibility of such a cooperative venture.